

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,451	12/12/2003	Randall Fuerst		2007
	7590 04/17/2007 CONN. ANALYTICAL CORP. Att: Joseph J. Bango, Jr. 696 AMITY ROAD BETHANY, CT 06524	EXAMINER		
Att: Joseph J. Bango, Jr.			VARGOT, MATHIEU D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,		•	1732	
				. <u></u>
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
30 DAVS		04/17/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

DATE MAILED:

UNIT U.S. Address

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
10/735,451				EXAMINER	
			M. VARG	M. VARGOT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER	
			1732	20070325	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## **Commissioner for Patents**

The reply filed on January 5, 2007 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): Applicant has amended the claims extensively, yet there is no indication of where the support for many of these amendments occurs. For instance, paragraphs (c) and (g) added to claim 1 and new claims 13 and 14 do not appear to be supported by the specification as originally filed. The same for the size of the fibers in new claim 10, some of the materials listed in new claim 11, and the prescriptive surface of claim 12. Also, there is no indication that the control of the mean fibril distance as recited in new claim 6 is related to forming a pattern that exceeds the perimeter of the lens. Instead of showing where support exists, applicant submits that the examiner has used hindsight to reject the claims. However, it should be noted that simply adding limitations to claims that are not supported by the original specification is a not sufficient to overcome an obviousness rejection. It is also not clear from the response whether applicant believes that the claims as originally presented were obvious but the instant are not. Given that support cannot be found for the instant claims, the response is submitted as being non-responsive to the previous rejection. See 37 CFR 1.111. Since the abovementioned reply appears to be bona fide, applicant is given ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a)

Mathieu D. Vargot Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1732

3/26/07